

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/660,529	Applicant(s) BORGAT, LOUIS	
	Examiner Darren W. Ark	Art Unit 3643	

All Participants:

(1) Darren W. Ark.

(2) Sebastien Clark.

Status of Application: Response to Non-Final

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 3 March 2006

Time: 2:00pm EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of the Non-Final Action mailed 10/27/2005

Claims discussed:

1, 4, 6, 26

Prior art documents discussed:

Prior art of record

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DARREN W. ARK
PRIMARY EXAMINER


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In regard to claim 26, Examiner stated that Markley et al. 6,922,936 discloses a handgrip (1428 or 1464 in Fig. 19) as claimed; a sleeve (1421); a removeable reel seat member with a cavity (1445 with 1416) adapted to slide onto the sleeve (see Fig. 19), the reel seat member having reel fasteners (see 36 in Fig. 1); a reel (12) mounted to the reel seat (of 1416); and a locking member (1450, 1424) for locking the sleeve to the reel seat member by inducing less than 360 degree rotation of the reel seat relative to the sleeve (bayonet-type connection). Examiner proposed to amend claim 26 such that the reel be mounted over the cavity of the reel seat member as similarly amended by applicant in claim 1 to overcome Markley et al. Examiner also proposed minor amendments to overcome claim objections and 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph problems for claims 1 (a missing comma), 4, and 6. Applicant agreed to the proposed changes. Please see the Examiner's Amendment for details.